

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, the claims are amended and claim 7 is cancelled; thus, the pending claims 1-6 and 8-22 remain for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added and accordingly, entry and approval of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

**STATUS OF THE CLAIMS:**

Claims 1-6 and 8-22 are pending.

Claims 1-6 and 8-22 are rejected.

**ITEMS 3-4: REJECTION OF CLAIM 20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH:**

The Office Action asserts that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the claimed "The plasma display device," as recited in claim 20. In accordance with the foregoing, claim 20 is amended, taking into consideration the Examiner's comments. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim rejection is respectfully requested.

**ITEMS 5-6: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5 and 19-22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), AS ALLEGEDLY BEING ANTICIPATED BY CORREA ET AL., EP 1,174,850 A1, HEREINAFTER "CORREA."**

Independent claims 1 and 20-22 are allegedly anticipated by Correa.

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 1 is amended to recite, "A method for driving a plasma display panel, wherein a display field comprises a plurality of successive display subfields having at least two different luminance ratios, producing a gradation display, each display subfield comprises at least an address period to write cells to be lit in the display subfield in accordance with corresponding display data and a sustain period to cause light emission to occur in the written cells, said method comprising: writing, after generating successively two or more all-cell write discharges, in the address period of a selected one of the plurality of successive display subfields in each display field, all of the cells to be written in the respective address periods of the plurality of successive display subfields in the display field, including the selected subfield; and applying sustain pulses to cause light emission in the respective sustain periods of the successive display subfields of the display field." Support for the claim amendment can be found, for example, in the Specification, at page 18 lines 3-24. Applicants

respectfully submit that Corea fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, the claimed "writing, after generating successively two or more all-cell write discharges, in the address period of a selected one of the plurality of successive display subfields in each display field," as recited, for example, in claim 1.

Corea discloses dividing subfields into a self-priming subfield (SPSF) and a refresh subfield (RSF). The SPSF includes soft priming, and an address period thereof is set to be longer than that of the RSF in order to eliminate the need for hard priming in the prior art (see, for example, Corea at FIG. 2 and at column 4, lines 27-51).

In contrast, the according to embodiment described in claim 1, a selected subfield lights all of the cells which are lit in any of the subsequent subfields in the display field and all of the cells which were to be lit the selected subfield after two or more all-cell write discharges. One benefit of the embodiment according to claim 1 is that it is possible to surely perform the address processing in the selected subfield.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that an anticipation rejection can not be based upon Corea, because Corea fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, each and every feature of the claimed embodiments, including the claimed "writing, after generating successively two or more all-cell write discharges, in the address period of a selected one of the plurality of successive display subfields in each display field," as recited, for example, in claim 1, because Corea merely discloses soft priming a SPSF.

The Office Action, at item 10, in rejecting claims 7, asserts that Tokunaga, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0067425, in Figure 18 and paragraph 158 of Tokunaga discloses the claimed "writing, after generating successively two or more all-cell write discharges, in the address period of a selected one of the plurality of successive display subfields in each display field."

Applicants respectfully submit the Tokunaga fails to disclose or suggest the claimed "writing, after generating successively **two or more all-cell write discharges**, in the address period of a selected one of the plurality of successive display subfields in each display field," because Tokunaga, at paragraph 158, discloses:

In the light emission driving sequence shown in FIG. 18, an odd-numbered row reset stage  $R_{ODD}$ , an odd-numbered row address stage  $W_{ODD}$ , an even-numbered row reset stage  $R_{EVE}$ , an even-numbered row address stage  $W_{sub.EVE}$ , a priming stage P, a sustain stage I, and an erasure stage E are sequentially performed in the first subfield SF1. Also, the odd-numbered row address stage  $W_{ODD}$ , even-numbered row address stage  $W_{EVE}$ , priming stage P, sustain stage I, and erasure stage E are performed in

sequence in each of the subfields SF2-SF(N).

In other words, Tokunaga discloses applying a reset to odd number rows and a reset to even number rows. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Tokunaga fails to disclose, either expressly or implicitly, the claimed “writing, after generating successively **two or more all-cell write discharges**, in the address period of a selected one of the plurality of successive display subfields in each display field,” because Tokunaga merely suggest applying a single reset to odd rows and a single reset to even rows, and, thus, fails to disclose generating “two or more all-cell write discharges.”

Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness based upon Corea and Tokunaga cannot be established, because Tokunaga discusses applying a single reset to odd rows and a single reset to even rows, and Corea discusses self-priming sub-field using soft priming. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Corea, Tokunaga and any combination thereof fails to disclose, either expressly or implicitly, the claimed “writing, after generating successively **two or more all-cell write discharges**, in the address period of a selected one of the plurality of successive display subfields in each display field,” as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no evidence that one skilled in the art would modify Corea, Tokunaga, or a combination of Corea and Tokunaga to include the claimed “writing, after generating successively **two or more all-cell write discharges**, in the address period of a selected one of the plurality of successive display subfields in each display field,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 20-22 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art for similar reasons as independent claim 1.

Dependent claims are patentably distinguishing at least due to their dependence from the independent claims and/or recite patentably distinguishing features of their own. Withdrawal of the rejection of the pending claims and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**ITEMS 7-9: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 6 AND 9-11 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER CORREA, IN VIEW OF AWAJI (JP 2000-148085).**

Dependent claims 6 and 9-11 are patentably distinguishing at least due to their dependence from the independent claims and/or recite patentably distinguishing features of their own. Withdrawal of the rejection of the pending claims and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**ITEM 10: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 8 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER CORREA, IN VIEW OF TOKUNAGA (US 2003/0067425).**

Dependent claims 8 are patentably distinguishing at least due to their dependence from the independent claims and/or recite patentably distinguishing features of their own. Withdrawal of the rejection of the pending claims and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**ITEM 11: REJECTION OF CLAIM 12 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103 (A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER CORREA, IN VIEW OF AWAJI, IN FURTHER VIEW OF TOKUNAGA.**

Dependent claim 12 is patentably distinguishing at least due to its dependence from the independent claims and/or recites patentably distinguishing features of its own. Withdrawal of the rejection of the pending claims and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**ITEM 12: REJECTION OF CLAIM 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103 (A)AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER CORREA, IN VIEW OF MOON (US 2003/0098826).**

Dependent claim 13 is patentably distinguishing at least due to its dependence from the independent claims and/or recites patentably distinguishing features of its own. Withdrawal of the rejection of the pending claims and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**ITEM 13: REJECTION OF CLAIM 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103 (A)AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER CORREA, IN VIEW OF HASHIMOTO ET AL. (US 2001/0017605) AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF TOKUNAGA.**

Dependent claim 14 is patentably distinguishing at least due to its dependence from the independent claims and/or recites patentably distinguishing features of its own. Withdrawal of the rejection of the pending claims and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**ITEM 14: REJECTION OF CLAIM 15 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103 (A)AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER CORREA, IN VIEW OF TOKUNAGA ET AL. (JP 2000-276106).**

Dependent claim 15 is patentably distinguishing at least due to its dependence from the independent claims and/or recites patentably distinguishing features of its own. Withdrawal of the rejection of the pending claims and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**ITEM 15: REJECTION OF CLAIM 16-18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103 (A) AS BEING**

**UNPATENTABLE OVER CORREA, IN VIEW OF KANAZAWA ET AL. (US 2001/0054993).**

Dependent claim 16-18 are patentably distinguishing at least due to their dependence from the independent claims and/or recite patentably distinguishing features of their own. Withdrawal of the rejection of the pending claims and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing has demonstrated that claims 1-6 and 8-22 patentably distinguish over the references and rejections of record.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 20, 2007

By: H. J. Staas  
H. J. Staas  
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501